(ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.)

ಮೋದಿಯವರಿಂದ ನೇತ್ರ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆ ಪಡೆದು ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಅಪಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಂದಲೂ ದೂರು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ eye operation ಶೇಕಡಾ 98ರಷ್ಟು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಫಲಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ವರದಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರು qualified hand ಅಲ್ಲ, registered practitioner ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನಾರೀತಿ ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಆರೋಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೋದಿಯವರು ಪಾಶ್ಚಿಮಾತ್ಯ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ನೇತ್ರ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಬಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಚಳಕವನ್ನು ರೋಗಿಗಳಮೇಲೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಶಸ್ಸುಗಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೋದಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಕಲ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲೂ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೋದಿಯವರು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿದ eye campsಗೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗಲೆಂದು ಐದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒದಗಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಸಿ. ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯ (ಕೋರ).—Actual ಆಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇವರಂತೆ ನೇತ್ರ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೀಣರಾದ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೇಕ್ರಿ, ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರು ಸಹ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ eye camps ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದೇರೀತಿ 1954-55ರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರತರಾದವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಹಾಯ, ಸಹಕಾರವನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಸಿದ್ದಮ್ಮನವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಐದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ದ್ರವ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯನೀಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಿನ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಭರವಸೆ ಇತ್ತಮೇಲೆ ಸೂಚಕರು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಸಿದ್ದಮ್ಮ.—ನನ್ನ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

No. 27.—Separation of Judiciary from the Executive.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Judiciary be separated from the Executive forthwith."

I will not repeat what I have already said. A cut motion was moved by me. Also some questions were asked on the floor of this House on the above subject. And answers were given by the Government. They said that a Committee has been working to consider the question of jurisdiction of courts and after the receipt of the report of the Committee this matter would be taken up for consideration. Meanwhile the Government have said also that this separation involves some financial implications. I may bring to the notice of the Government that this will not involve them in any financial implications because I have read the reports in Madras. There a Subordinate Judge is appointed as District Magistrate. We are also having subordinate judges here. They can act as District Magistrates and they can have civil work also. That means no further financial implications.

Another point is: the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said the other day that there are some magistrates who are civilians, just to give them some training these civilians are appointed as magistrates. But when we are thinking of completely separating the Judiciary from the Executive why should training be given to these IAS officers? It is unnecessary, because they can be only revenue heads and there is no necessity to give them training in magistrates' courts. So civilians may be removed and some munsiffs appointed in those places. And I do not think that a large sum of money can be spent for these. In fact we are surprised to learn that in Madras and other States they are expediting the introduction of this separation. In Madras, this system has been introduced in more districts. This year also they have introduced it in more districts. At least, why not we make a beginning, an experiment in Mysore? They can introduce the separation in one or two districts. After all that will not involve the Government in any expenditure. I hope that after the receipt of the report from the Committee, the Government will go ahead with the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive.

Many persons have supported this move. Sri K. Pattabhi Raman among others has said that it is very necessary that Judiciary has to be separated from the Executive.

With this I move this resolution for the acceptance of the House.

4 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution moved:

"That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Judiciary be separated from the Executive forthwith."

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, as you were pleased to observe, this question has been discussed on the floor of the House rather threadbare on a number of occasions. I do not think I can add anything useful now at this stage. As soon as the Committee's report is received, Government will consider what action has to be taken. Government will have to take a decision in the light of the present circumstances and I can only say that at the suitable time, the suggestion of the Hon'ble Member as contained in this resolution will be considered.

I hope my Hon'ble friend will be good enough to withdraw his resolution.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—I beg leave to withdraw the resolution.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

No. 28.—Scrutiny by Legislature of Legislative authority delegated to Government.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly is of opinion that all rules, regulations or notifications and amendments thereto made or issued in the exercise of legislative authority delegated to Government or any officer thereof by any legislative enactment shall be laid before each House of the Legislature as soon as may be after they are made or issued and shall be subject to such modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment, as both Houses of the Legislature may make during the Session in which they are so laid."

Sir, in commending this resolution for the acceptance of the House, I should like to say that during the course of the debate upon the Budget, I have had occasion to explain at considerable length the necessity for enabling this House to scrutinise on appropriate occasions and in appropriate manner the exercise of legislative authority delegated to Government or to other executive agencies by legislative enactment passed in either House of Legislature. Sir, the modern tendency, not merely in the State of Mysore or even in the Indian Union, but in democratic countries all over the world so far as my acquaintance with them proceeds upon the reading of books, is to prepare legislative bills in the form of skeleton drafts and to entrust executive agencies with the task of filling in the details of legislation; and though it may be said that the exigencies of modern democratic government make it necessary for the entrustment of this task of filling in the details of the legislative measures to executive agencies, still it has never been disputed in any State either in India or in any other country. that the legislature ought to have further opportunity of scrutinising how and to what purpose and to what extent the authority so delegated to executive agency has been exercised and what form the rules, regulations or other notifications issued in exercise of that delegated legislative authority have taken.

Sir, you are aware that in many of the legislative measures that come before this House, a stock argument—in the best meaning of that expression—adduced in support of these legislative measures by the spokesmen of the Government who sponsor such legislative measures has been and I suppose will continue to be, that similar legislation has been enacted in the neighbouring State of Madras or the neighbouring State of Bombay or some other State of the Indian Union. It is a